

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 11, 21 23 and 24 do not introduce any new subject matter.

**OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION**

The Examiner objects to the title of the invention because “the title of the invention is not descriptive.”

Applicant has amended the specification to the title to more clearly indicate the invention to which the claims are directed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

**OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT**

Applicant has amended the abstract so that it does not exceed 150 words and it is clear and concise.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,279 (“Milway”).

Claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 have been amended to recite that each table corresponds to one output port of a plurality of output ports.

For example, Applicant’s disclosure states that “each respective lookup table 60-63 stores only information for identifiers directed to a specific output port. For example, lookup table 60 stores information for identifiers directed to a first output port and

lookup table 63 stores information for identifiers directed to a fourth output port. Therefore, an identifier applied to the switching apparatus through an input port can be searched for in lookup tables of all output ports simultaneously, so that the time taken to search for a destination is substantially reduced. Use of such lookup tables reduces a load for a destination decision, allowing use of a lower speed memory when compared with conventional switching apparatuses." See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, page 10, line 23 – page 11, line 9.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Milway fails to teach each table corresponding to only one output port. The Examiner maintains that Milway teaches that each table corresponds to at least one output port. See July 26, 2007 Office Action at 3. However, in contrast to the claimed embodiments, Milway states that auxiliary portion of routing table 720 contains route words 540 and new header words 550 for each output port 210-j. Accordingly, Milway's table corresponds to every output port, not one output port of a plurality of output ports as claimed. See Milway, col. 19, lines 38-44.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 11, 21, 23 and 24 are not anticipated by Milway. For at least the reason that claims 2-10 depend from claim 1, claims 12-20 depend from claim 11, and claim 22 depends from claim 21, claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22 are also submitted not to be anticipated by the cited reference.

As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicants' Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael F. Morano", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael F. Morano  
Reg. No. 44,952  
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
(516) 692-8888